



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,724	05/15/2001	Emma L Wood	124-852	9963

23117 7590 05/20/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

YAMNITZKY, MARIE ROSE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

10

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/831,724

Applicant(s)

WOOD ET AL.

Examiner

Marie R. Yamnitzky

Art Unit

1774

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☒ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

Formula I in proposed amended claim 1 is still missing the curved line connecting A and D as shown in original claim 1.

With respect to proposed amended claims 10 and 11, the issue under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph becomes: what is the distinction between at least one of a hole transporter, an electron transporter or a light emitter which the layer additionally includes per claims 10 and 11, and the hole transporter, electron transporter and light emitter that are already included in the layer per claim 1?

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants' arguments and the Rule 132 Declaration are not persuasive with respect to the patentability of the claims over the applied prior art.

The comparison of devices as set forth in the Rule 132 Declaration is not considered to represent a comparison with the closest prior art in the case of art applicable to devices comprising a material of general formula I in which AD is the first possibility set forth in claim 1 (JP 9-289081). Further, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 cannot be overcome by a showing of unexpected/superior results. The examiner again notes that the "single layer" language of the present claims merely requires that a single organic layer comprise materials having hole transporting, electron transporting and light emitting capabilities. The "single layer" language does not exclude the presence of more than one organic layer between the electrodes (the device of dependent claim 5 comprising two organic layers between the electrodes).

The Rule 132 Declaration provides no comparative data directed to the claimed embodiments in which AD of the material of general formula I is the second or third possibility set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, the Rule 132 Declaration is not persuasive with respect to the rejections in which the Boyer et al. and Czerney et al. references are applied.



MARIE YAMNITZKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1774